

REMARKS

Claims 2, 7, 10, 11, 13-15, 18 and 19 have been withdrawn from consideration and have therefore been canceled.

Claims 1, 3, and 4 have been amended. Claims 21-25 are added by this amendment.

Claim 1 has been rejected as anticipated by Regard et al. Claim 1 has been amended to add a limitation not suggested by Regard et al., which makes no suggestion of the legs comprising barrels received on stubs, instead teaching legs 6a, 6b hingedly fixed to base 2. Claims 3 and 4 are amended consonant with the amendment of claim 1.

Claims 12 and 16 stand rejected as anticipated by Gasser. Applicant asserts that Gasser is not pertinent. Gasser teaches a stabilizer, not a bow stand, and makes no suggestion that the compound stabilizer it teaches could serve as a bow stand. Only if one ignores the essence of the instant invention, that being of a bow stand, would one look to Gasser for relevant guidance. Clearly Gasser's device could not function as a bow stand because Gasser's forward stabilizer 6 is directed in an opposing direction to the direction of the counterstabilizers 8, 9.

Because Gasser is not pertinent, claim 12 should be held allowable, and if allowable, then dependent claim 16 would be likewise allowable. Applicant submits that claims 12 and 16 are allowable.

Claims 3, 8 and 9 have been objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. These claims now depend from amended claim 1 which is asserted to now be allowable.

Claims 17 and 20 have been objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. As asserted above, rejection of independent claim 12 should be withdrawn. Therefore claims 17 and 20 would not depend from a rejected base claim.


Claims 21-25 have been newly added. Applicant asserts that these claims are allowable over the pertinent prior art of record. Claim 21 includes the limitation that the legs be selectively removable. Regard et al. teaches legs 6a, 6b which are hingedly fixed to plate 2 which mounts to

the stabilizer opening of the bow. Regard et al. teaches away from removability of legs 6a and 6b because the legs may be folded toward the bow and held by leg bracket 24.

Claim 23 includes the limitation that the legs and a stabilizer form a tripod. Gasser is not pertinent because it does not teach a bow stand. Even if Gasser were pertinent, the free ends of the stabilizers do not form a tripod. In addition, since the plate 2 of Regard et al. mounts to the stabilizer opening 1, there can be no stabilizer to provide the third leg of a tripod. Claims 21 - 25 distinguish over the prior art of record.

Applicant asserts that all pending claims are allowable and requests that upon further consideration, a Notice of Allowance be issued. Any questions or discussion about this response should be addressed to Allan L. Harms at 319-363-8905.


Respectfully submitted,



Allan L. Harms
2750 First Avenue N.E., Suite 420
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402
319-363-8905
fax 319-363-8906
allanharms@wenzelharms.com

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,558

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Fee Amendment, Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 7, 2005.



Allan L. Harms, Reg. No. 27,558
Attorney for Applicant